



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/720,761	03/26/2001	Franz Laermer	10191/1629	5642

26646 7590 06/18/2003

KENYON & KENYON
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER

CHEN, KIN CHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1765

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2003

//

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/720,761

Applicant(s)

LAERMER ET AL.

Examiner

Kin-Chan Chen

Art Unit

1765

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: _____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____

K. C. Chen.
Kin-Chan Chen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1765

Response to the reconsideration request (after the final rejection)

1. Applicant has argued that Flamm et al do not show polymer that have any passivating properties at all. It is not persuasive. Applicant's submitted a certified translation of German Application No. 199 19 469.6 is considered. The reference of Singh et al (US 6,187,666) as evidence is withdrawn. However, as stated in the office action, Flamm teaches using C_2F_6 in anisotropic etching of silicon, because **same material is used in the same process as claimed**, therefore it would inherently contain same property such as passivating. Applicant does not comment or acknowledge same.

When the examiner has reason to believe that functional language asserted to be critical for establishing novelty in claimed subject matter may, in fact be an inherent characteristic of the prior art as discussed above, the burden of proof is shifted to the applicant to prove that the subject matter shown in the prior art does not possess the characteristics relied upon. *In re Fitzgerald et al.* 205 USPQ 594.

2. Applicant has argued that there is no motivation to combine the prior art. It is not persuasive. As stated in the office action, they have been taught to be useful for the same purpose (etching silicon substrate).

"It is prima facie obvious to use two compositions (two methods) each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose." *In re Kerkhoven* 205 USPQ 1069 (CCPA 1980). *In re Susi* 169 USPQ 423, 426 (CCPA 1971). See also *Ex parte Quadranti* 25 USPQ 2d 1071 (BPAI 1992).

Art Unit: 1765

Furthermore, adding inert gas is notoriously well-known and obvious in the art of plasma etching.

Incorporation of a carrier or diluent was held to have been obvious. *In re Lerner* 169 USPQ 51 (CCPA 1971); *In re Rosicky* 125 USPQ 341 (CCPA 1960).

3. In light of the comments above, the obviousness rejections are maintained.

K. C. Feltner